UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,250	03/09/2001	Paul H. Feinberg	SONY 3.0-042	7066

530 7590 11/19/2003

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER	
BROWN, VERNAL U	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2635	3

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/803,250	FEINBERG, PAUL H.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vernal U Brown	2635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 March 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 March 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

The application of Paul Feinberg for method and Apparatus For Facilitating Communication between a user and a toy filed March 9, 2001 has been examined. Claims 1-47 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Snyder et al. U.S Patent 6361396.

Regarding claim 26, Snyder et al. teaches a method, comprising:

providing at least one mobile item operable to be carried by a user (col. 4 lines 22-25) and emit an answer electromagnetic wave in response to receiving a query electromagnetic wave (col. 7 lines 34-38);

providing a toy operable to emit the query electromagnetic wave and receive the answer electromagnetic wave(col. 7 lines 23-28); and selecting an output to issue from the toy that is perceptible by the user based on the answer electromagnetic wave (col. 4 lines 22-30).

Regarding claims 27-28, Snyder et al. teaches the toy includes at least one output transducer (709) operable to produce the output perceptible by the user, and the at least one output transducer includes at least one of an audio transducer (col. 4 lines 29-31).

Regarding claim 29, Snyder et al. teaches providing at least two mobile items each operable to produce a respective answer electromagnetic wave in response to a query electromagnetic wave; and selecting the at least one phrase based on which one or more of the answer electromagnetic waves are received (col. 4 lines 25-31).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder et al. U.S Patent 6361396 in view of Lastinger U.S Patent 6104311.

Regarding claim 1, Snyder et al. teaches a toy including a query circuit (105) and an interaction circuit (215), the query circuit being operable to emit the query electromagnetic wave and receive the answer electromagnetic wave (col. 4 lines 25-28), and the interaction circuit being operable to select an output perceptible by the user based on the answer electromagnetic wave (col. 4 lines 63-66). Snyder et al. further teaches identifying a mobile object brought in

proximity to the toy by detecting the resonant frequency of the object (col. 4 lines 12-16) but is not explicit in teaching a radio frequency tag operable to produce an answer electromagenetic wave. Lastinger in an art related invention in the same field of endeavor of radio frequency tag teaches the identification of a RFID tag by detecting the resonant frequency of the tag and the radio frequency tag operable to produce an answer electromagenetic wave (col. 8 lines 25-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a radio frequency tag operable to produce an answer electromagenetic wave in Snyder et al. as evidenced by Lastinger because Snyder et al. suggests a toy emitting query signal and identifying an object based on the response (answer electromagenetic) and Lastinger teaches the use a radio frequency tag operable to produce an answer electromagenetic wave in response to a query wave.

Regarding claims 2-3, Snyder et al. teaches the interaction circuit produces an output perceptible to a user (col. 4 lines 28-31) and teaches a transducer (709) coupled to the output circuit (figure 7).

Regarding claims 4-5, Snyder et al. teaches the interaction circuit is operable to select at least one phrase from among a plurality of phrases based on the answer electromagnetic wave and the output transducer includes the audio transducer, which is operable to produce an audible phrase corresponding to the selected phrase (col. 4 lines 25-31).

Regarding claim 9, Snyder et al. teaches a toy including a query circuit (105) and an interaction circuit (215), the query circuit being operable to emit the query electromagnetic wave and receive the answer electromagnetic wave (col. 4 lines 25-28), and the interaction circuit being operable to select an output perceptible by the user based on the answer electromagnetic wave (col. 4 lines 63-66). Snyder et al. further teaches identifying a mobile object brought in

proximity to the toy by detecting the resonant frequency of the object (col. 4 lines 12-16) but is not explicit in teaching a radio frequency tag operable to produce an answer electromagenetic wave. Lastinger in an art related invention in the same field of endeavor of radio frequency tag teaches the identification of a RFID tag by detecting the resonant frequency of the tag and the radio frequency tag operable to produce an answer electromagenetic wave (col. 8 lines 25-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a radio frequency tag operable to produce an answer electromagenetic wave in Snyder et al. as evidenced by Lastinger because Snyder et al. suggests a toy emitting query signal and identifying an object based on the response (answer electromagenetic) and Lastinger teaches the use a radio frequency tag operable to produce an answer electromagenetic wave in response to a query wave.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder et al. U.S Patent 6361396 in view of Lastinger U.S Patent 6104311 and further in view of Gabai et al. U.S Patent 6290566.

Regarding claims 6-8, Snyder et al. teaches the interaction circuit giving a response in the form of a phrase (col. 4 lines 28-30) and further teaches giving a response phrase based on the identified object (col. 4 lines 24-30) but is silent on teaching associating a user defined phrase with one or more of the answer electromagnetic wave. Gabai et al. in an art related interactive toy teaches selecting a user defined phrase base on the receive answer signal (col. 3 lines 13-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate a user defined phrase with one or more of the answer electromagnetic wave in Snyder et al. as evidenced by

Gabai et al. because Snyder et al. suggests the interaction circuit giving a response in the form of a phrase and Gabai et al. teaches selecting a user defined phrase base on the receive answer signal.

Claims 10-16 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder et al. U.S Patent 6361396 in view of Lastinger.U.S Patent 6104311 and further in view of Karr U.S Patent 5661470.

Regarding claims 10-11, Snyder et al. teaches the interaction circuit output a response based on the identified object (col. 4 lines 25-30) but is silent on teaching radio frequency tag(s) disposed at respective physical locations. Karr in an art related Object Recognition System invention teaches radio frequency tag(s) disposed at different physical locations (col. 2 lines 54-55) and the output perceptible by the user is based on the answer signal received (col. 2 lines 26-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have radio frequency tag(s) disposed at respective physical locations in Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger as evidenced by Karr because Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger suggests outputting a response based on the identified object and Karr teaches radio frequency tag(s) disposed at different physical locations and the output perceptible by the user is based on the answer signal received.

Regarding claim 12, Snyder et al. teaches the object to be identified produce an answer electromagnetic having a frequency content that is different from others of the answer electromagnetic waves and the interaction circuit is operable to distinguish which one or more of

the answer electromagnetic waves are received based on the frequency content (col. 4 lines 4-15). Snyder et al. is however silent on teaching the radio frequency tags is operable to produce an answer electromagnetic wave including at least one of frequency content that is different from others of the answer electromagnetic waves, and the interaction circuit is operable to distinguish which one or more of the answer electromagnetic waves are received based on the frequency content. Lastinger in an art related invention in the same field of endeavor of radio frequency tag operable to produce an answer electromagnetic wave including at least one of frequency content that is different from others of the answer electromagnetic waves and distinguish which one or more of the answer electromagnetic waves are received based on the frequency content of the response signal (col. 8 lines 25-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the radio frequency tags is operable to produce an answer electromagnetic wave including at least one of frequency content that is different from others of the answer electromagnetic waves, and the interaction circuit is operable to distinguish which one or more of the answer electromagnetic waves are received based on the frequency content in Snyder et al. as evidenced by Lastinger because Snyder et al. suggests the object to be identified produce an answer electromagnetic having a frequency content that is different from others of the answer electromagnetic waves and the interaction circuit is operable to distinguish which one or more of the answer electromagnetic waves are received based on the frequency content and Lastinger teaches radio frequency tag operable to produce an answer electromagnetic wave including at least one of frequency content that is different from others of the answer electromagnetic waves and distinguish one or more of

the answer electromagnetic waves are received based on the frequency content of the response signal.

Regarding claim 13, Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger teaches receiving electromagnetic wave transmitted (col. 9 lines 54-58) but is silent on teaching the interaction circuit is operable to store indication of the received answer electromagnetic wave. Karr in an art related Object Recognition System invention teaches the interaction circuit is operable to store indication of the received answer electromagnetic wave (col. 4 lines 20-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the interaction circuit is operable to store indication of the received answer electromagnetic wave in Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger as evidenced by Karr because Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger suggests receiving electromagnetic wave transmitted and Karr teaches storing the indication of the received electromagnetic wave to facilitate the processing of the received signal.

Regarding claims 14-15, Snyder et al. teaches the use of a look up table (213) to compare the resonant frequencies of the identified object with the preprogram signature data (col. 4 lines 55-61) and further teaches the interaction circuit is output is based on the identified object (col. 4 lines 25-31) but is not explicit in teaching assigned tag and index numbers. One skilled in the art recognizes that the use of a look up table is based on the use of index numbers in order to access a particular entry in the look up table.

It would have been one ordinary skill in the art to have assigned tag and index numbers in Snyder et al. because suggests the use of look up table to compare the resonant frequencies of the identified object with the preprogram signature data and one skilled in the art recognizes that the

use of a look up table is based on the use of index numbers in order to access a particular entry in the look up table.

Regarding claims 16 and 22, Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger teaches detecting an object in proximity to the toy (col. 4 lines 25-27) but is silent on teaching the plurality of output includes characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations. Karr in an art related Object Recognition System invention teaches the plurality of output includes characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations (col. 2 lines 27-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the plurality of output includes characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations in Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger as evidenced by Karr because Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger suggests claim 16, Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger teaches and Karr teaches the plurality of output includes characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations.

Claims 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder et al. U.S Patent 6361396 in view of Lastinger U.S Patent 6104311 in view of Karr U.S Patent 5661470 and further in view of Pelekis U.S Patent 6380844.

Regarding claims 17-18, Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger in view of Karr teaches the plurality of output includes characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations as discussed in the response to claim 16 but is silent on teaching plurality of outputs include characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical

locations including the type of room. Pelekis in an art related invention in the same field of endeavor of interactive toys teaches the plurality of outputs include characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations including the type of room (col. 3 18-21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the plurality of outputs include characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations including the type of room in Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger in view of Karr as evidenced by Pelekis because Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger in view of Karr teaches the plurality of output includes characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations and Pelekis teaches the plurality of outputs include characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations including the type of room.

Regarding claims 19-20, Snyder et al. teaches the interaction circuit produces an output perceptible to a user (col. 4 lines 28-31) and teaches a transducer (709) coupled to the output circuit (figure 7).

Regarding claim 21, Snyder et al. teaches the interaction circuit is operable to select at least one phrase from among a plurality of phrases based on the answer electromagnetic wave and the output transducer includes the audio transducer, which is operable to produce an audible phrase corresponding to the selected phrase (col. 4 lines 25-31).

Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder et al. U.S Patent 6361396 in view of Lastinger U.S Patent 6104311 in view of Karr U.S Patent 5661470 in view of Pelekis U.S Patent 6380844 and further in view of Gabai et al. U.S Patent 6290566.

Regarding claims 23-24, Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger in view Karr in view of Pelekis teaches the interaction circuit giving a response in the form of a phrase (col. 4 lines 28-30) and further teaches giving a response phrase based on the identified object (col. 4 lines 24-30) but is silent on teaching associating a user defined phrase with one or more of the answer electromagnetic wave. Gabai et al. in an art related interactive toy teaches selecting a user defined phrase base on the receive answer signal (col. 3 lines 13-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate a user defined phrase with one or more of the answer electromagnetic wave in Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger in view Karr in view of Pelekis as evidenced by Gabai et al. because Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger in view Karr in view of Pelekis suggests the interaction circuit giving a response in the form of a phrase and Gabai et al. teaches selecting a user defined phrase base on the receive answer signal.

Regarding claim 25, Snyder et al. teaches that the resonant frequency of the answer signal is based on the object selected by the user and the object is identify by the answer signal (col. 4 lines 12-16). The answer signal therefore serves the purpose of identifying the object and is further control by the object selected.

Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder et al. U.S Patent 6361396 in view of Lastinger U.S Patent 6104311 and further in view of Gabai et al. U.S Patent 6290566.

Regarding claim 30-31, Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger teaches the interaction circuit giving a response in the form of a phrase (col. 4 lines 28-30) and further teaches giving a response phrase based on the identified object (col. 4 lines 24-30) but is silent on teaching associating a user defined phrase with one or more of the answer electromagnetic wave. Gabai et al. in an art related interactive toy teaches selecting a user defined phrase base on the receive answer signal (col. 3 lines 13-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate a user defined phrase with one or more of the answer electromagnetic wave in Snyder et al. as evidenced by Gabai et al. because Snyder et al. suggests the interaction circuit giving a response in the form of a phrase and Gabai et al. teaches selecting a user defined phrase base on the receive answer signal.

Regarding claim 32, Snyder et al. teaches that the resonant frequency of the answer signal is based on the object selected by the user and the object is identify by the answer signal (col. 4 lines 12-16). The answer signal therefore serves the purpose of identifying the object and is further control by the object selected.

Claims 33-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder et al. U.S Patent 6361396 in view of Lastinger U.S Patent 6104311 in view of Gabai et al. U.S Patent 6290566 and further in view of Karr U.S Patent 5661470.

Regarding claims 33-36, Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger in view of Gabai et al. teaches that the resonant frequency of the answer signal is based on the object selected by the user and the object is identify by the answer signal (col. 4 lines 12-16) but is however silent on teaching providing a plurality of radio frequency tags operable to produce respective answer

electromagnetic waves in response to the query electromagnetic wave and further disposing the tag at different location. Karr in an art related Object Recognition System invention teaches providing a plurality of radio frequency tags operable to produce respective answer electromagnetic waves in response to the query electromagnetic wave and selecting the output perceptible by the user based on which of the one or more answer electromagnetic waves are received (col. 6 lines 4-13). Karr further teaches disposing the tag at different locations (col. 2 lines 27-34). .

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a plurality of radio frequency tags operable to produce respective answer electromagnetic waves in response to the query electromagnetic wave in Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger in view of Gabai et al. as evidenced by Karr because Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger in view of Gabai et al. suggests the answer signal is based on the object selected by the user and the object is identify by the answer signal and Karr teaches a plurality of radio frequency tags operable to produce respective answer electromagnetic waves in response to the query electromagnetic wave and selecting the output perceptible by the user based on which of the one or more answer electromagnetic waves are received.

Regarding claim 37, Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger in view of Gabai et al. teaches receiving electromagnetic wave transmitted (col. 9 lines 54-58) but is silent on teaching the interaction circuit is operable to store indication of the received answer electromagnetic wave. Karr in an art related Object Recognition System invention teaches the interaction circuit is operable to store indication of the received answer electromagnetic wave (col. 4 lines 20-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the interaction circuit is operable to store indication of the received answer electromagnetic wave in Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger in view of Gabai et al. as evidenced by Karr because Snyder et al. in view of Lastinger suggests receiving electromagnetic wave transmitted and Karr teaches storing the indication of the received electromagnetic wave to facilitate the processing of the received signal.

Regarding claims 38-39, Snyder et al. teaches the use of a look up table (213) to compare the resonant frequencies of the identified object with the preprogram signature data (col. 4 lines 55-61) and further teaches the interaction circuit is output is based on the identified object (col. 4 lines 25-31) but is not explicit in teaching assigned tag and index numbers. One skilled in the art recognizes that the use of a look up table is based on the use of index numbers in order to access a particular entry in the look up table.

It would have been one ordinary skill in the art to have assigned tag and index numbers in Snyder et al. because suggests the use of look up table to compare the resonant frequencies of the identified object with the preprogram signature data and one skilled in the art recognizes that the use of a look up table is based on the use of index numbers in order to access a particular entry in the look up table.

Claims 40-41 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder et al. U.S Patent 6361396 in view of Pelekis U.S Patent 6380844.

Regarding claims 40-41, Snyder et al. teaches detecting an object in proximity to the toy (col. 4 lines 25-27) but is silent on teaching plurality of outputs include characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations including the type of room.

Pelekis in an art related invention in the same field of endeavor of interactive toys teaches the plurality of outputs include characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations including the type of room (col. 3 18-21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the plurality of outputs include characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations including the type of room in Snyder et al. as evidenced by Pelekis because Snyder et al. suggests detecting an object in proximity and Pelekis teaches the plurality of outputs include characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations including the type of room.

Regarding claim 43, Snyder et al. teaches the toy includes at least one output transducer (709) operable to produce the output perceptible by the user, and the at least one output transducer includes at least one of an audio transducer (col. 4 lines 29-31).

Regarding claim 44, Snyder et al. teaches selecting at least one phrase from among a plurality of phrases based on the one or more answer electromagnetic waves and producing an output signal corresponding to the selected phrase (col. 4 lines 19-31).

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder et al. U.S Patent 6361396 in view of Pelekis U.S Patent 6380844 and further in view of Karr U.S Patent 5661470.

Regarding claim 45, Snyder et al. in view of Pelekis teaches detecting an object in proximity to the toy (col. 4 lines 25-27) but is silent on teaching the plurality of output includes characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations. Karr in an

art related Object Recognition System invention teaches the plurality of output includes characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations (col. 2 lines 27-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the plurality of output includes characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations in Snyder et al. in view of Pelekis as evidenced by Snyder et al. because Snyder et al. in view of Pelekis suggests detecting an object in proximity to the toy and Karr teaches outputting a plurality of output and the plurality of output includes characteristics that correspond to respective characteristics of the physical locations.

Claims 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder et al. U.S Patent 6361396 in view of Pelekis U.S Patent 6380844 in view of Karr U.S Patent 5661470 and further in view of Gabai et al. U.S Patent 6290566.

Regarding claims 46-47, Snyder et al. in view of Pelekis in view of Karr teaches the interaction circuit giving a response in the form of a phrase (col. 4 lines 28-30) and further teaches giving a response phrase based on the identified object (col. 4 lines 24-30) but is silent on teaching associating a user defined phrase with one or more of the answer electromagnetic wave. Gabai et al. in an art related interactive toy teaches selecting a user defined phrase base on the receive answer signal (col. 3 lines 13-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate a user defined phrase with one or more of the answer electromagnetic wave in Snyder et al. in view of Pelekis in view of Karr as evidenced by Gabai et al. because Snyder et al. in view of Pelekis in view of

Karr suggests the interaction circuit giving a response in the form of a phrase based on the identified object and Gabai et al. teaches selecting a user defined phrase base on the receive answer signal.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vernal U Brown whose telephone number is 703-305-3864. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 8:30 AM-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 703-305-4704. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

Vernal Brown
November 13, 2003

MICHAEL HORABIK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600